

(3) Permit exchanging information with State and Tribal agencies administering programs under titles IV, XIX, and XXI of the Act, to the extent necessary to carry out those State and Tribal agency responsibilities under such programs in accordance with section 454A(f)(3) of the Act, and to the extent that it does not interfere with IV-D program meeting its own obligations.

(4) Prohibit the disclosure of NDNH, FCR, financial institution, and IRS information outside the IV-D program except that:

(i) IRS information is restricted as specified in the Internal Revenue Code;

(ii) Independently verified information other than financial institution information may be released to authorized persons;

(iii) NDNH and FCR information may be disclosed without independent verification to IV-B and IV-E agencies for the purposes of establishing parentage or establishing parental rights with respect to a child; and

(iv) NDNH and FCR information may be disclosed without independent verification to IV-A agencies for the purpose of assisting States to carry out their responsibilities of administering the Title IV-A programs.

\* \* \* \* \*

**§ 307.15 Approval of advance planning documents for computerized support enforcement systems.**

(a) *Approval of an APD.* The Office shall not approve the APD and annually updated APD unless the document, when implemented, will carry out the requirements of § 307.10, or § 307.11 of this part. Conditions for APD approval are specified in this section.

(b) *Conditions for initial approval.* In order to be approvable, an APD for a statewide computerized support enforcement system described under § 307.10, or § 307.11 must meet the following requirements:

(1) The APD must represent the sole systems effort being undertaken by the State in accordance with § 307.10, or § 307.11. If the State is requesting a waiver under § 302.85 of this chapter, the APD must specify the conditions for which waiver is requested;

(2) The APD must specify how the objectives of the computerized support enforcement system in § 307.10, or § 307.11 will be carried out throughout the State; this includes a projection of how the proposed system will meet the functional requirements of § 307.10, or § 307.11 and how the single State system will encompass all political subdivi-

sions in the State by October 1, 1997, or October 1, 2000 respectively.

(3) The APD must assure the feasibility of the proposed effort and provide for the conduct of a requirements analysis study which address all system components within the State and includes consideration of the program mission, functions, organization, services and constraints related to the computerized support enforcement system;

(4) The APD must indicate how the results of the requirements analysis study will be incorporated into the proposed system design, development, installation or enhancement;

(5) The APD must contain a description of each component within the proposed computerized support enforcement system as required by § 307.10, or § 307.11 and must describe information flows, input data, and output reports and uses;

(6) The APD must describe the security requirements to be employed in the proposed computerized support enforcement system;

(7) The APD must describe the intrastate and interstate interfaces set forth in § 307.10, or § 307.11 to be employed in the proposed computerized support enforcement system;

(8) The APD must describe the projected resource requirements for staff, hardware, and other needs and the resources available or expected to be available to meet the requirements;

(9) The APD must contain a proposed budget and schedule of life-cycle milestones relative to the size, complexity and cost of the project which at a minimum address requirements analysis, program design, procurement and project management; and, a description of estimated expenditures by category and amount for:

(i) Items that are eligible for funding at the enhanced matching rate, and

(ii) Items related to developing and operating the system that are eligible for Federal funding at the applicable matching rate;

(10) The APD must contain an implementation plan and backup procedures to handle possible failures in system planning, design, development, installation or enhancement.

(i) These backup procedures must include provision for independent validation and verification (IV&V) analysis of a State's system development effort in the case of States:

(A) That do not have in place a state-wide automated child support enforcement system that meets the requirements of the FSA of 1988;

(B) States which fail to meet a critical milestone, as identified in their APDs;

(C) States which fail to timely and completely submit APD updates;

(D) States whose APD indicates the need for a total system redesign;

(E) States developing systems under waivers pursuant to section 452(d)(3) of the Social Security Act; or,

(F) States whose system development efforts we determine are at risk of failure, significant delay, or significant cost overrun.

(ii) Independent validation and verification efforts must be conducted by an entity that is independent from the State (unless the State receives an exception from OCSE) and the entity selected must:

(A) Develop a project workplan. The plan must be provided directly to OCSE at the same time it is given to the State.

(B) Review and make recommendations on both the management of the project, both State and vendor, and the technical aspects of the project. The IV&V provider must provide the results of its analysis directly to OCSE at the same time it reports to the State.

(C) Consult with all stakeholders and assess the user involvement and buy-in regarding system functionality and the system's ability to meet program needs.

(D) Conduct an analysis of past project performance sufficient to identify and make recommendations for improvement.

(E) Provide risk management assessment and capacity planning services.

(F) Develop performance metrics which allow tracking project completion against milestones set by the State.

(iii) The RFP and contract for selecting the IV&V provider (or similar documents if IV&V services are provided by other State agencies) must include the

experience and skills of the key personnel proposed for the IV&V analysis and specify by name the key personnel who actually will work on the project and must be submitted to OCSE for prior approval.

(11) The APD must describe each system considered during planning including the advantages of selecting the proposed solution. If a transfer system is not selected as the proposed solution, a transfer system must be among those systems considered. If a system that is already in place in the State could be enhanced to meet the requirements for a computerized support enforcement system, that system must be among the solutions considered;

(12) The APD must contain a cost benefit analysis of the proposed computerized support enforcement system and all alternatives considered that describes the proposed improvements to the IV-D program in both qualitative and quantitative terms;

(13) The APD must specify the basis for determining direct and indirect costs of the computerized support enforcement system during development and operation, including the methodology for determining costs of planning, design, development, installation or enhancement that are eligible for 90 percent Federal funding versus costs of development and operations that are eligible for Federal funding at the applicable matching rate;

(14) The APD must contain a statement indicating the period of time the State expects to use the proposed computerized support enforcement system; and

(15) The APD must include any waiver requested in accordance with §307.5 of this chapter.

(c) *Conditions for approval of annual update.* The APD for a computerized support enforcement system described under §307.10, or §307.11 must be updated annually. In order to be approvable, the annual update of an APD for a computerized support enforcement system described under §307.10 must

meet only those requirements of paragraph (b) of this section that are prescribed by instructions issued by the Office.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0960-0343)

[49 FR 33260, Aug. 22, 1984, as amended at 51 FR 37732, Oct. 24, 1986; 55 FR 4379, Feb. 7, 1990; 57 FR 47004, Oct. 14, 1992; 61 FR 67241, Dec. 20, 1996; 63 FR 44816, Aug. 21, 1998]

**§ 307.20 Submittal of advance planning documents for computerized support enforcement systems.**

The State IV-D agency must submit an APD for a computerized support enforcement system, approved and signed by the State IV-D Director and the appropriate State official, in accordance with the submission process prescribed in 45 CFR part 95, subpart F.

[55 FR 4379, Feb. 7, 1990, as amended at 57 FR 47005, Oct. 14, 1992]

**§ 307.25 Review and certification of computerized support enforcement systems.**

The Office will review, assess and inspect the planning, design, development, installation, enhancement and operation of computerized support enforcement systems developed under § 307.10, or § 307.11 to determine the extent to which such systems:

(a) Meet the requirements found in § 307.15; and

(b) Can be certified as meeting the requirements described in § 307.10 and in the OCSE guideline entitled “Automated Systems for Child Support Enforcement: A Guide for States”.

[57 FR 47005, Oct. 14, 1992, as amended at 63 FR 44817, Aug. 21, 1998]

**§ 307.30 Federal financial participation at the 90 percent rate for state-wide computerized support enforcement systems.**

(a) *Conditions that must be met for FFP.* During the Federal fiscal years 1996, and 1997, Federal financial participation is available at the 90 percent rate in expenditures for the planning, design, development, installation or enhancement of a computerized support enforcement system as described in §§ 307.5 and 307.10 limited to the amount in an advance planning document, or APDU submitted on or before

September 30, 1995, and approved by OCSE if:

(1) The Office has approved an APD in accordance with § 307.15 of this part;

(2) The system meets the requirements specified in § 307.10;

(3) The Office determines that the expenditures incurred are consistent with the approved APD;

(4) The Office determines that the computerized support enforcement system or alternative system configuration is designed effectively and efficiently and will improve the management and administration of the State IV-D plan;

(5) The State IV-D agency agrees in writing to use the system for a period of time which is consistent with the APD approved by the Office; and

(6) The State or local government has ownership rights in software, software modifications and associated documentation that is designed, developed, installed, or enhanced with 90 percent FFP under this section subject to the Department of Health and Human Services license specified in paragraph (c) of this section.

(b) *Federal financial participation in the costs of hardware and proprietary software.* (1) Until September 30, 1997, FFP at the 90 percent rate is available in expenditures for the rental or purchase of hardware for the planning, design, development, installation or enhancement of a computerized support enforcement system as described in § 307.10 in accordance with the limitation in paragraph (a) of this section.

(2) Until September 30, 1997, FFP at the 90 percent rate is available for expenditures for the rental or purchase of proprietary operating/vendor software necessary for the operation of hardware during the planning, design, development, installation or enhancement of a computerized support enforcement system in accordance with the limitation in paragraph (a) of this section, and the OCSE guideline entitled “Automated Systems for Child Support Enforcement: A Guide for States.” FFP at the 90 percent rate is not available for proprietary application software developed specifically for a computerized support enforcement system. § 307.35 of this part regarding